

# Voluntary Quits

December 2006



**Employment Security Department**  
WASHINGTON STATE

**Contact:** Office of Communication & Legislation, 360-902-9308

**Online:** [www.studies.go2ui.com](http://www.studies.go2ui.com)

## Why we did this study

In 2003, then-Governor Gary Locke signed into law a new provision that restricted the reasons a person can quit a job and still qualify for unemployment-insurance benefits.

When signing the new law, Governor Locke expressed concerns about the potential effects of the changes and directed the department to track the effects and report back by June 30, 2005.

Findings were reported, but due to time constraints, only covered a six-month period and did not allow for the full effects of the law to be determined.

This study expands on the 2005 study to provide a more comprehensive look at the effects of the changes to voluntary-quit provisions.

---

The complete report is available online at [www.studies.go2ui.com](http://www.studies.go2ui.com).

For more information, contact the Office of Communication & Legislation at 360-902-9308.

## What we found

**Background:** To be eligible for unemployment benefits, a person must have worked a certain number of hours and must have lost his or her job through no fault of his or her own. In 2003, a new law was passed that specified ten reasons a person could quit his or her job and still be eligible for benefits. Prior to that, the law was much broader and the department had greater latitude when deciding whether to allow benefits. The new law took effect on January 4, 2004.

**Scope:** The study team looked at all unemployment claims from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005 that were filed by people who had voluntarily quit their jobs.

**Findings:** During the study period, people who had voluntarily quit their jobs filed just over 31,000 unemployment claims. The department's decision on whether to allow benefits on about 28,000 claims would have been the same under both old and new laws. The other almost 3,300 claims (10.5 percent) would have been granted benefits under the old law, but were denied under the new law. This group was the primary focus of this study.

The study team looked at demographics to determine who was most affected by the change in law. Gender was the factor that saw the most significant difference. The denial rate for women increased by 12 percentage points compared to an increase of 8.9 percentage points for men.

The reasons people who were denied benefits quit their jobs fell into one of three categories:

- Work-related factors, such as reduction in hours or wages, abusive working conditions and commute issues, accounted for 43 percent of denials.
- Domestic or marital responsibilities, such as losing child care, relocating because of a spouse's job transfer and relocating to marry, accounted for 30 percent of denials.
- Illness or disability of claimant or immediate family member accounted for 27 percent of denials. This was primarily leaves of absence.

Of these categories, domestic or marital responsibility showed the most significant disparity along gender lines. More than 71 percent of all denials in this category were women, while only 29 percent were men. This is consistent with the trends identified in the 2005 *Voluntary Quit* study.

Only about 2 percent of the people who were denied benefits under the new law filed appeals. Half of those were overturned and the people were granted benefits.

Almost 19 percent of those who were denied subsequently re-qualified for benefits and had been paid a total of \$1.9 million as of June 30, 2006.

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Background .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Findings .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Who is affected by law changes</i>	
<i>Work-related reasons for quitting vs. non-work-related reasons</i>	
<i>Appeals</i>	
<i>Potential effect on benefit payments</i>	
<i>Re-qualifying for benefits</i>	
<b>Scope .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Conclusions .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>Mandate for this study</i>	
<i>Internet resources</i>	
<i>Study team</i>	
<i>Appendix A - RCW 50.20.050</i>	
<i>Appendix B - New law compared to old law</i>	
<i>Appendix C - Quit reasons denied by new law, allowed under old law</i>	

## Introduction

To be eligible for unemployment benefits, a person must have worked a certain number of hours and must have lost his or her job through no fault of his or her own. In 2003, then-Governor Gary Locke signed into law a new provision that restricted the reasons a person can quit a job and still qualify for unemployment-insurance benefits.

When signing the new law, Governor Locke expressed concerns about the potential effects of the changes and directed the department to track the effects and report back by June 30, 2005<sup>1</sup>. Findings were reported, but due to time constraints, only covered a six-month period and did not allow for the full effects of the law to be determined. This study expands on the 2005 study to provide a more comprehensive look at the effects of the changes to voluntary-quit provisions.

## Background

The new law signed in 2003 took effect on January 4, 2004. It specified ten reasons a person could quit his or her job and still be eligible for unemployment benefits<sup>2</sup>. Prior to that, the law was much broader and the Employment Security Department had greater latitude when deciding whether to allow benefits.

Ten reasons people can quit work and still be eligible for unemployment benefits <sup>3</sup>	
New law	Change from previous law
1. Bona fide offer of work.	None.
2. Illness/disability of claimant; illness, disability, or death of claimant's immediate family.	Claimant must now terminate employment and is not entitled to reinstatement to same or comparable job. This requirement did not exist in old law. Therefore, leaves of absence are treated differently in new law than in old law.
3. Relocate due to spouse's mandatory military transfer outside of labor market to a state that also allows benefits in this situation <sup>4</sup> .	New law allows only if military employer; old law was for any employer-initiated mandatory transfer.  New law allows only if the transfer is to a state that also allows benefits for this reason (currently, 17 states); old law did not include this restriction.

<sup>1</sup> Text of Governor Locke's partial veto message: I am not vetoing section 4, which establishes a list of personal and work-related reasons that an individual may quit for *good cause* and receive UI benefits while searching for other work. However, without the benefit of experience, I appreciate concerns expressed about the unforeseeable nature of some of the practical effects of these amendments. Accordingly, I hereby instruct the Commissioner of the Department of Employment Security to track all impacts associated with the amendments in section 4, and to report her findings to me by June 2005.

<sup>2</sup> Second Engrossed Senate Bill 6097 was signed into law by then-Governor Gary Locke on June 20, 2003. Section 4 amended RCW 50.20.050, which defines denial and allowance of benefits for individuals who leave work voluntarily. See Appendix A.

<sup>3</sup> Sources: RCW 50.20.050 and Employment Security Department, UI Division Research and Analysis

<sup>4</sup> Effective January 4, 2004 – July 2, 2006. For claims effective on or after July 2, 2006, the law no longer requires the relocation to be to a state that would allow benefits for this reason.

4. Domestic violence or stalking.	None.
5. Usual compensation reduced 25 percent or more.	New law specifies percent of reduction; old law did not.
6. Usual hours reduced 25 percent or more.	Under old law, the department had latitude to apply the criteria of "other work connected factors as the commissioner may deem pertinent", "substantial involuntary deterioration of the work factor", and "unreasonable hardship on the individual". New law does not give this option.
7. Increased distance or difficulty of travel and greater commute than customary in labor market due to worksite change.	New law applies only if the worksite location changed. Old law denied if distance was both: (a) known at time of hire and (b) the department judged distance to be customary for job classification and labor market. Old law allowed if either (a) or (b) was not the case. Old law also gave the department ability to apply "unreasonable hardship on the individual" criterion.
8. Work site safety deteriorated, was reported, but uncorrected.	Old law did not require safety deterioration or reporting of condition. The department used the basis of "degree of risk involved to the individual's health, safety..."
9. Illegal activities at the worksite, were reported, but uncorrected.	Old law did not specify illegality of activities, and did not require reporting of condition. The department had latitude on the basis of "degree of risk involved to the individual's health, safety, and morals...and such other work connected factors as the commissioner may deem pertinent." New law does not give this option.
10. Usual work changed and now violates religious convictions or sincere moral beliefs.	Under old law, the department had latitude on the basis of "degree of risk involved to the individual's health, safety, and morals" and on the basis of "unreasonable hardship on the individual" regardless of whether or not a change had occurred. New law does not give this option.

**Figure 1**

If a person does not meet the criteria above, he or she will be denied benefits for a period of seven weeks and until he or she has returned to work and earned at least seven times his or her weekly benefit amount.

To determine the effects of the 2003 law change, this study answers the following questions:

- Who is affected by the laws on voluntary quit where there are different outcomes (denials) required under the newer law?
- Do denials under the current law have a disproportionate impact on groups by gender, ethnicity, age, education, industry, occupation, or other demographics?
- Did the trends reported in June 2005 in decisions on work-related reasons versus non-work-related reasons for quitting continue for subsequent decisions?

- What are the potential effects on unemployment benefit payments under the new laws?
- How is the appeals process impacting these decisions?
- To what degree do claimants denied for quitting work later requalify for benefits?

## Findings

People who had voluntarily quit their jobs filed just over 31,000 unemployment claims from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005. The department's decision on whether to allow benefits on about 28,000 claims would have been the same under both old and new laws. The other almost 3,300 claims would have been granted benefits under the old law, but were denied under the new law. This means that 10.5 percent more people would have been granted benefits under the old law. This group was the primary focus of this study<sup>5</sup>.

### Who is affected by law changes

The study team looked at the demographics for the group of 3,300 claims that would have been granted benefits under the old law to determine who was most affected by the change in law. Gender was the factor that saw the most significant difference. The denial rate for women increased by 12 percentage points compared to an increase of 8.9 percentage points for men.

While all subgroups saw an increase in denials, no other subgroup had as significant an increase in denial rates.

Decisions under new law compared to decisions under old law, total and by gender <sup>6</sup>								
	New law		Different outcome*	Old law		Old law	New law	Difference
	# Allow**	# Deny		# Allow	# Deny**	% Deny	% Deny	
<b>ALL</b>	7,719	23,443	3,279	10,998	20,164	64.7	75.2	10.5
Women	3,902	11,983	1,913	5,815	10,070	63.4	75.4	12.0
Men	3,817	11,460	1,366	5,183	10,094	66.1	75.0	8.9

\* Different outcome: Denied under new law, allowed under old law.

\*\* Same outcome both laws

Figure 2

### Work-related reasons for quitting vs. non-work-related reasons

For the almost 3,300 claims that were denied under the new law, but would have been allowed under the old law, denials fell into one of three general categories<sup>7</sup>:

- **Work-related factors:** Includes reduction in hours or wages by less than 25 percent; abusive working conditions; commute issues; etc.<sup>8</sup> - 43 percent.

<sup>5</sup> See Figure 2 for details.

<sup>6</sup> Percentages may not total 100 percent due to rounding. See Appendix B for full breakouts by demographics.

Source: Employment Security Department, UI Division GUIDE System

<sup>7</sup> See Appendix C.

<sup>8</sup> Examples: Abusive situations (e.g., poor behavior, profane language, bullying) that violated workplace standards or worker rights, but did not rise to the level of illegal activity or unsafe work conditions; Accepting work in another state on a trial basis, then quitting because time away from home became an "unreasonable hardship"; Working

- **Domestic or marital responsibilities:** Includes losing child care; relocating because of a spouse's job transfer; relocating to marry; etc.<sup>9</sup> - 30 percent.
- **Illness or disability of claimant or immediate family member:** Primarily leaves of absence due to a temporary condition<sup>10</sup> - 27 percent.

Of these categories, domestic or marital responsibility showed the most significant disparity along gender lines. More than 71 percent of all denials in this category were women, while only 29 percent were men. This may be explained by the fact that domestic and marital responsibilities predominantly fall to women in a household and when these responsibilities do not constitute *good cause* under voluntary quit laws, women stand to be denied at a greater rate than men.

This finding is consistent with the trends identified in the 2005 *Voluntary Quit* study<sup>11</sup>.

Reason for quits, by gender, under new law <sup>12</sup>							
	# deny	%	Women # deny	Men # deny	Women % total denials	Men % total denials	Difference
All	3,279	100	1,913	1,366	58.3	41.7	16.7
Work-related factors	1,411	43.0	709	702	50.2	49.8	0.5
Domestic or marital responsibilities	993	30.3	708	285	71.3	28.7	42.6
Illness/disability of claimant or immediate family member	875	26.7	496	379	56.7	43.3	13.4

Figure 3

## Appeals

Just over 2 percent of denials for a voluntary quit that would have been allowed under the old law resulted in an appeal – 72 out of 3,279 denials. About half of those cases were overturned and the claimants were granted benefits through the appeals process.

## Potential effect on benefit payments

For the almost 3,300 claims that would have been granted benefits under the old law, but were denied under the new law, the maximum benefits available was \$21.5 million. This study did not attempt to measure the actual benefit payment effect of the new voluntary quit law.

---

both a full-time and a part-time job in another area, then being laid off from the full-time job and subsequently quitting the part-time job because it was unreasonable to continue the commute for only part-time wages.

<sup>9</sup> Examples: Relocating due to a spouse's employer-initiated, mandatory transfer that was not the military; Losing child care or needing time off to help a child in legal trouble or facing school expulsion.

<sup>10</sup> Examples: Flight attendants placed on leave because bargaining agreement prevents them from being assigned to other job duties; Pregnant health care professionals who cannot be exposed to x-rays.

<sup>11</sup> Available online at [www.studies.go2ui.com](http://www.studies.go2ui.com).

<sup>12</sup> Source: Employment Security Department, UI administrative records.

## Re-qualifying for benefits

About 19 percent (603) of the people who were denied under the new law subsequently re-qualified for benefits. Their average weekly benefit amount was \$249 and they had been paid a total of \$1.9 million as of June 30, 2006.

## Scope

---

The new law applies to UI claims effective on or after January 4, 2004.

A proposed study methodology was developed in collaboration with the Unemployment Insurance Advisory Committee with their approval in September 2003.

The data analyzed in the study came from Employment Security's Unemployment Insurance claimant records and UI non-monetary claim adjudicator files. The variables studied included gender, race, age, language preference, education, residence, union status, occupation, and industry of the job separation.

The data studied included the following:

- All July 2004 – June 2005 voluntary quit decisions adjudicated under the new law, referred to in this document as New Law (31,162 decisions: 7,719 Allowances and 23,443 Denials)
- Same July 2004 – June 2005 voluntary quit decisions (as in previous bullet) adjusted to represent the outcomes that would have occurred had the old law still been in effect, referred to in this document as Old Law (31,162 decisions: 10,998 Allowances and 20,164 Denials)
- Voluntary quit decisions in July 2004 – June 2005 that had a different outcome under the new law than would have occurred under the old law. These decisions are all denial decisions that would have been allowed under the old law. There is no scenario where claimants would be allowed under the new law but would have been denied under the old law. (3,279 denials, which are a subset of the 23,443 New Law denial decisions)
- Weekly benefit amounts and maximum benefits payable as of June 30, 2006 for individuals denied under the new law who would have been allowed under the old law.

The analysis focused on these areas:

- Denial rates of New Law compared to Old Law (both overall and for each variable).
- The average weekly benefit amount and total maximum benefits payable as of June 30, 2006 for those denied under the new law who would have been allowed under the old law.

The data were tested for significance, revealing the following:

- For New Law denials compared to the Old Law denials, the outcomes by gender could not be explained as variations caused by chance.



## Conclusions

---

The findings from this study are consistent with the findings from the 2005 study: women were most affected by changes to the voluntary-quit provisions and domestic or marital responsibility as the reason for quitting showed the most significant disparity along gender lines.

This study expanded on the previous study by examining appeals and re-qualification for benefits by those who had been denied under the new law:

- Only about 2 percent of the people who were denied benefits under the new law filed appeals. Half of those were overturned and the people were granted benefits.
- Almost 19 percent of those who were denied subsequently re-qualified for benefits and had been paid a total of \$1.9 million as of June 30, 2006.

## Appendices

---

### **Mandate for this study**

Early versions of SSB 6885 (section 7) required a continuation of the study of the voluntary quit provisions of chapter 4, Laws of 2003 2 Special Session (2ESB 6097), remarking that the June 2005 report on the impacts of those provisions “indicated that a number of the changes seemed to disproportionately impact women, although the department indicated that because (the laws) had gone into effect less than a year before the report was due, it did not have sufficient data to definitively state the impact of the voluntary quit provisions”.

### **Internet resources**

Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6885 (ESSB 6885):

<http://www.leg.wa.gov/pub/billinfo/2005-06/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Passed%20Legislature/6885-S.PL.pdf>

### **Study team**

- Gary Bodeutsch, ESD – Labor Market and Economic Analysis
- Kevin Hill, ESD – UI Research and Analysis
- Jerry Iyall, ESD—UI Management
- Judy Johnson, ESD – UI Legislative Services
- Gary Kamimura, ESD—Workforce Administration
- Jeff Robinson, ESD – Labor Market and Economic Analysis
- Ina Schmidt, ESD—Information Technology Services
- Lois Smith, ESD—UI Research and Analysis
- Darrell Wallace, ESD – UI Research and Analysis
- Jim Wilkins, ESD—UI Nonmonetary Review

**RCW 50.20.050**

**Disqualification for leaving work voluntarily without good cause.**

(1) With respect to claims that have an effective date before January 4, 2004:

(a) An individual shall be disqualified from benefits beginning with the first day of the calendar week in which he or she has left work voluntarily without good cause and thereafter for seven calendar weeks and until he or she has obtained bona fide work in employment covered by this title and earned wages in that employment equal to seven times his or her weekly benefit amount.

The disqualification shall continue if the work obtained is a mere sham to qualify for benefits and is not bona fide work. In determining whether work is of a bona fide nature, the commissioner shall consider factors including but not limited to the following:

- (i) The duration of the work;
- (ii) The extent of direction and control by the employer over the work; and
- (iii) The level of skill required for the work in light of the individual's training and experience.

(b) An individual shall not be considered to have left work voluntarily without good cause when:

(i) He or she has left work to accept a bona fide offer of bona fide work as described in (a) of this subsection;

(ii) The separation was because of the illness or disability of the claimant or the death, illness, or disability of a member of the claimant's immediate family if the claimant took all reasonable precautions, in accordance with any regulations that the commissioner may prescribe, to protect his or her employment status by having promptly notified the employer of the reason for the absence and by having promptly requested reemployment when again able to assume employment: PROVIDED, That these precautions need not have been taken when they would have been a futile act, including those instances when the futility of the act was a result of a recognized labor/management dispatch system;

(iii) He or she has left work to relocate for the spouse's employment that is due to an employer-initiated mandatory transfer that is outside the existing labor market area if the claimant remained employed as long as was reasonable prior to the move; or

(iv) The separation was necessary to protect the claimant or the claimant's immediate family members from domestic violence, as defined in RCW [26.50.010](#), or stalking, as defined in RCW 9A.46.110.

(c) In determining under this subsection whether an individual has left work voluntarily without good cause, the commissioner shall only consider work-connected factors such as the degree of risk involved to the individual's health, safety, and morals, the individual's physical fitness for the work, the individual's ability to perform the work, and such other work connected factors as the commissioner may deem pertinent, including state and national emergencies. Good cause shall not be established for voluntarily leaving work because of its distance from an individual's residence where the distance was known to the individual at the time he or she accepted the employment and where, in the judgment of the department, the distance is customarily traveled by workers in the individual's job classification and labor market, nor because of any other significant work factor which was

generally known and present at the time he or she accepted employment, unless the related circumstances have so changed as to amount to a substantial involuntary deterioration of the work factor or unless the commissioner determines that other related circumstances would work an unreasonable hardship on the individual were he or she required to continue in the employment.

(d) Subsection (1)(a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to an individual whose marital status or domestic responsibilities cause him or her to leave employment. Such an individual shall not be eligible for unemployment insurance benefits beginning with the first day of the calendar week in which he or she left work and thereafter for seven calendar weeks and until he or she has requalified, either by obtaining bona fide work in employment covered by this title and earning wages in that employment equal to seven times his or her weekly benefit amount or by reporting in person to the department during ten different calendar weeks and certifying on each occasion that he or she is ready, able, and willing to immediately accept any suitable work which may be offered, is actively seeking work pursuant to customary trade practices, and is utilizing such employment counseling and placement services as are available through the department. This subsection does not apply to individuals covered by (b)(ii) or (iii) of this subsection.

(2) With respect to claims that have an effective date on or after January 4, 2004:

(a) An individual shall be disqualified from benefits beginning with the first day of the calendar week in which he or she has left work voluntarily without good cause and thereafter for seven calendar weeks and until he or she has obtained bona fide work in employment covered by this title and earned wages in that employment equal to seven times his or her weekly benefit amount.

The disqualification shall continue if the work obtained is a mere sham to qualify for benefits and is not bona fide work. In determining whether work is of a bona fide nature, the commissioner shall consider factors including but not limited to the following:

- (i) The duration of the work;
- (ii) The extent of direction and control by the employer over the work; and
- (iii) The level of skill required for the work in light of the individual's training and experience.

(b) An individual is not disqualified from benefits under (a) of this subsection when:

- (i) He or she has left work to accept a bona fide offer of bona fide work as described in (a) of this subsection;

(ii) The separation was necessary because of the illness or disability of the claimant or the death, illness, or disability of a member of the claimant's immediate family if:

(A) The claimant pursued all reasonable alternatives to preserve his or her employment status by requesting a leave of absence, by having promptly notified the employer of the reason for the absence, and by having promptly requested reemployment when again able to assume employment. These alternatives need not be pursued, however, when they would have been a futile act, including those instances when the futility of the act was a result of a recognized labor/management dispatch system; and

(B) The claimant terminated his or her employment status, and is not entitled to be reinstated to the same position or a comparable or similar position;

(iii) He or she: (A) Left work to relocate for the spouse's employment that, due to a mandatory military transfer: (I) Is outside the existing labor market area; and (II) is in Washington or another state that, pursuant to statute, does not consider such an individual to have left work voluntarily without good cause; and (B) remained employed as long as was reasonable prior to the move;

(iv) The separation was necessary to protect the claimant or the claimant's immediate family members from domestic violence, as defined in RCW 26.50.010, or stalking, as defined in RCW 9A.46.110;

(v) The individual's usual compensation was reduced by twenty-five percent or more;

(vi) The individual's usual hours were reduced by twenty-five percent or more;

(vii) The individual's worksite changed, such change caused a material increase in distance or difficulty of travel, and, after the change, the commute was greater than is customary for workers in the individual's job classification and labor market;

(viii) The individual's worksite safety deteriorated, the individual reported such safety deterioration to the employer, and the employer failed to correct the hazards within a reasonable period of time;

(ix) The individual left work because of illegal activities in the individual's worksite, the individual reported such activities to the employer, and the employer failed to end such activities within a reasonable period of time; or

(x) The individual's usual work was changed to work that violates the individual's religious convictions or sincere moral beliefs.

[2003 2nd sp.s. c 4 § 4; 2002 c 8 § 1; 2000 c 2 § 12; 1993 c 483 § 8; 1982 1st ex.s. c 18 § 6; 1981 c 35 § 4; 1980 c 74 § 5; 1977 ex.s. c 33 § 4; 1970 ex.s. c 2 § 21; 1953 ex.s. c 8 § 8; 1951 c 215 § 12; 1949 c 214 § 12; 1947 c 215 § 15; 1945 c 35 § 73; Rem. Supp. 1949 § 9998-211. Prior: 1943 c 127 § 3; 1941 c 253 § 3; 1939 c 214 § 3; 1937 c 162 § 5.]

# Appendix B

## New law compared to old law – by variable

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Voluntary Quit Decisions	NEW LAW		DIFFERENT OUTCOME	OLD LAW		OLD LAW	NEW LAW	Prctng Point Differ-ence (7) - (6)	OLD LAW	NEW LAW	Prctng Point Differ-ence (10) - (9)
July 2004 -June, 2005	# Allow	# Deny	# Deny	# Allow	# Deny	% Deny	% Deny		% of Total Denials*	% of Total Denials*	
TOTAL: 31,162	(same outcome both laws) (4) - (3)	(3) + (5)	(deny new law / allow old law) (2) - (5)	(1) + (3)	(same outcome both laws) (2) - (3)	(5) ÷ [(4)+(5)]	(2) ÷ [(1)+(2)]		(5) ÷ (5)ALL	(2) ÷ (2)ALL	
ALL	7,719	23,443	3,279	10,998	20,164	64.7%	75.2%	10.5	100.0%	100.0%	N/A
<b>GENDER</b>											
Women	3,902	11,983	1,913	5,815	10,070	63.4%	75.4%	12.0	49.9%	51.1%	1.2
Men	3,817	11,460	1,366	5,183	10,094	66.1%	75.0%	8.9	50.1%	48.9%	-1.2
<b>RACE</b>											
White	5,819	16,915	2,447	8,266	14,468	63.6%	74.4%	10.8	71.8%	72.2%	0.4
Black	419	1,452	217	636	1,235	66.0%	77.6%	11.6	6.1%	6.2%	0.1
Hispanic	682	2,272	216	898	2,056	69.6%	76.9%	7.3	10.2%	9.7%	-0.5
Amrcn Indn / Alskn Ntv	166	711	80	246	631	71.9%	81.1%	9.1	3.1%	3.0%	-0.1
Asian / Pacific Islander	371	1,230	199	570	1,031	64.4%	76.8%	12.4	5.1%	5.2%	0.1
Unidentified	262	863	120	382	743	66.0%	76.7%	10.7	3.7%	3.7%	0.0
<b>LANGUAGE</b>											
English	7,359	22,572	3,201	10,560	19,371	64.7%	75.4%	10.7	96.1%	96.3%	0.2
Spanish	269	635	30	299	605	66.9%	70.2%	3.3	3.0%	2.7%	-0.3
Chinese	6	18	3	9	15	62.5%	75.0%	12.5	0.1%	0.1%	0.0
Vietnamese	28	66	11	39	55	58.5%	70.2%	11.7	0.3%	0.3%	0.0
Laotian	2	7	2	4	5	55.6%	77.8%	22.2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0
Russian	23	64	10	33	54	62.1%	73.6%	11.5	0.3%	0.3%	0.0
Polish	1	1	-	1	1	50.0%	50.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0
Korean	8	17	5	13	12	48.0%	68.0%	20.0	0.1%	0.1%	0.0
Other	23	63	17	40	46	53.5%	73.3%	19.8	0.2%	0.3%	0.0
<b>AGE GROUP</b>											
Under 18		1	1	1	0	0.0%	100.0%	100.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0
18-20	25	210	13	36	197	83.8%	89.4%	5.5	1.0%	0.9%	-0.1
21-24	470	2,761	256	726	2,505	77.5%	85.5%	7.9	12.4%	11.8%	-0.6
25-34	1,844	7,772	1,027	2,871	6,745	70.1%	80.8%	10.7	33.5%	33.2%	-0.3
35-44	2,196	6,136	920	3,116	5,216	62.6%	73.6%	11.0	25.9%	26.2%	0.3
45-54	2,096	4,384	689	2,785	3,695	57.0%	67.7%	10.6	18.3%	18.7%	0.4
55-59	602	1,281	220	822	1,061	56.3%	68.0%	11.7	5.3%	5.5%	0.2
60 & Up	486	898	153	639	745	53.8%	64.9%	11.1	3.7%	3.8%	0.1
Unknown											
<b>EDUCATION LEVEL</b>											
None	110	361	33	143	328	69.6%	76.6%	7.0	1.6%	1.5%	-0.1
1-7 yrs	167	379	27	194	352	64.5%	69.4%	4.9	1.7%	1.6%	-0.1
8 yrs	50	171	24	74	147	66.5%	77.4%	10.9	0.7%	0.7%	0.0
9-11 yrs	509	2,457	279	788	2,178	73.4%	82.8%	9.4	10.8%	10.5%	-0.3
High School Diploma	2,630	8,451	1,155	3,785	7,296	65.8%	76.3%	10.4	36.2%	36.0%	-0.1
GED	474	1,961	247	721	1,714	70.4%	80.5%	10.1	8.5%	8.4%	-0.1
Some College/Vocnl	2,224	5,942	897	3,121	5,045	61.8%	72.8%	11.0	25.0%	25.3%	0.3
Associate Degree / Vocational Certificate	688	1,598	221	909	1,377	60.2%	69.9%	9.7	6.8%	6.8%	0.0
Bachelors Degree	704	1,740	319	1,023	1,421	58.1%	71.2%	13.1	7.0%	7.4%	0.4
Masters Degree	141	327	64	205	263	56.2%	69.9%	13.7	1.3%	1.4%	0.1
PHD Degree	22	56	13	35	43	55.1%	71.8%	16.7	0.2%	0.2%	0.0
<b>RESIDENCE</b>											
Rural	1,678	5,716	659	2,337	5,057	68.4%	77.3%	8.9	25.1%	24.4%	-0.7
Urban	5,140	14,519	2,034	7,174	12,485	63.5%	73.9%	10.3	61.9%	61.9%	0.0
Out-of-State	901	3,208	586	1,487	2,622	63.8%	78.1%	14.3	13.0%	13.7%	0.7
<b>UNION STATUS</b>											
Full Referral	502	646	94	596	552	48.1%	56.3%	8.2	2.7%	2.8%	0.0
Qualified Referral	23	26	4	27	22	44.9%	53.1%	8.2	0.1%	0.1%	0.0
Non-Union	7,194	22,771	3181	10,375	19,590	65.4%	76.0%	10.6	97.2%	97.1%	0.0

\* Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Table continued on next page

**New law compared to old law – by variable (continued)**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Voluntary Quit Decisions	NEW LAW		DIFFERENT OUTCOME	OLD LAW		OLD LAW	NEW LAW	Prcntg Point Differ-ence	OLD LAW	NEW LAW	Prcntg Point Differ-ence
July 2004 – June 2005	# Allow	# Deny	# Deny	# Allow	# Deny	% Deny	% Deny		% of Total Denials*	% of Total Denials*	
TOTAL: 31,162	(same outcome both laws) (4) - (3)	(3) + (5)	(deny new law / allow old law) (2) - (5)	(1) + (3)	(same outcome both laws) (2) - (3)	(5) ÷ [(4)+(5)]	(2) ÷ [(1)+(2)]	(7) - (6)	(5) ÷ (5) ALL	(2) ÷ (2) ALL	(10) - (9)
ALL	7,719	23,443	3,279	10,998	20,164	64.7%	75.2%	10.5	100.0%	100.0%	N/A
<b>OCCUPATION</b>											
Profsnl/Techncl/Mgmt	2,607	7,580	1,229	3,836	6,351	62.3%	74.4%	12.1	31.5%	32.3%	0.8
Clerical/Sales	1,595	5,248	735	2,330	4,513	66.0%	76.7%	10.7	22.4%	22.4%	0.0
Service	1,168	4,353	586	1,754	3,767	68.2%	78.8%	10.6	18.7%	18.6%	-0.1
Agric/Forest/Fish	317	996	85	402	911	69.4%	75.9%	6.5	4.5%	4.2%	-0.3
Processing	305	871	97	402	774	65.8%	74.1%	8.2	3.8%	3.7%	-0.1
Machine Trades	302	904	106	408	798	66.2%	75.0%	8.8	4.0%	3.9%	-0.1
Benchwork	95	216	34	129	182	58.5%	69.5%	10.9	0.9%	0.9%	0.0
Structural	867	2,199	256	1,123	1,943	63.4%	71.7%	8.3	9.6%	9.4%	-0.3
Miscellaneous	463	1,076	151	614	925	60.1%	69.9%	9.8	4.6%	4.6%	0.0
<b>INDUSTRY</b>											
Agric / Forest / Fish	293	826	50	343	776	69.3%	73.8%	4.5	3.9%	3.5%	-0.3
Mining	12	26	4	16	22	57.9%	68.4%	10.5	0.1%	0.1%	0.0
Construction	584	1,676	190	774	1,488	65.8%	74.2%	8.4	7.4%	7.1%	-0.2
Manufacturing	665	2,148	298	963	1,856	65.8%	76.4%	10.6	9.2%	9.2%	0.0
Trnsprtn / Cmmnctn / Utilities	450	1,243	200	650	1,044	61.6%	73.4%	11.8	5.2%	5.3%	0.1
Wholesale	278	934	132	410	802	66.2%	77.1%	10.9	4.0%	4.0%	0.0
Retail	1,010	3,655	539	1,549	3,124	66.8%	78.3%	11.6	15.5%	15.6%	0.1
Finance / Insurance / Real Estate	460	1,287	210	670	1,077	61.6%	73.7%	12.0	5.4%	5.5%	0.1
Service	2,642	9,215	1,350	3,992	7,877	66.3%	77.7%	11.4	39.1%	39.3%	0.2
Public Administration	42	132	14	56	118	67.8%	75.9%	8.0	0.6%	0.6%	0.0
Not Classified	1,283	2,301	327	1,610	1,980	55.1%	64.2%	9.1	9.8%	9.8%	0.0

\* Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

## Appendix C

### Quit reasons denied by new law, allowed under old law

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	DIFFERENT OUTCOME DECISIONS					
QUIT REASON	TOTAL # DENY (2) + (3)	WOMEN # DENY	MEN # DENY	WOMEN % OF TOTAL DENIALS (2) ÷ (1)	MEN % OF TOTAL DENIALS (3) ÷ (1)	PERCENTAGE POINT DIFFERENCE (4) vs. (5)
<b>ALL</b>	<b>3,279</b>	<b>1,913</b>	<b>1,366</b>	<b>58.3%</b>	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>16.7</b>
<b>WORK-RELATED</b>	<b>1,411</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>702</b>	<b>50.2%</b>	<b>49.8%</b>	<b>0.5</b>
Deterioration of work factors (miscellaneous)	952	521	431	54.7%	45.3%	9.5
Compensation reduced	100	34	66	34.0%	66.0%	-32.0
Hours reduced	93	48	45	51.6%	48.4%	3.2
Illegal activities at worksite	78	42	36	53.8%	46.2%	7.7
Safety factors at worksite	83	25	58	30.1%	69.9%	-39.8
Religious factors	23	11	12	47.8%	52.2%	-4.3
Distance/difficulty of travel	82	28	54	34.1%	65.9%	-31.7
<b>MARITAL OR DOMESTIC RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	<b>993</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>71.3%</b>	<b>28.7%</b>	<b>42.6</b>
Domestic responsibility	586	392	194	66.9%	33.1%	33.8
Marital responsibility	268	200	68	74.6%	25.4%	49.3
Follow spouse due to employer-initiated, mandatory transfer	109	94	15	86.2%	13.8%	72.5
Married and moved outside normal commute distance	21	18	3	85.7%	14.3%	71.4
Attend previously-approved Commissioner Approved Training	9	4	5	44.4%	55.6%	-11.1
<b>ILLNESS/DISABILITY</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>56.7%</b>	<b>43.3%</b>	<b>13.4</b>
Illness/disability of claimant	642	363	279	37.8%	29.0%	8.7
Illness/disability/death of claimant's immediate family member	243	139	104	14.5%	10.8%	3.6

\* Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.